

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action dated February 15, 2007. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due consideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

On August 8, 2007, Applicants' representative and the Examiner conducted a telephone interview to discuss the formal objection to the drawings and the rejection against claim 3. During the interview, it was agreed that if claim 3 were canceled and if the description of Figure 1 on page 11 of the specification were amended, the application would be allowed. Applicants' representative a later date communicated with the Examiner that Applicants' had agreed to the amendment and to the cancellation of claim 3. Applicants thank the Examiner for his consideration.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-2 are under consideration in this application. Claim 3 is being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Formality Rejection

Figure 1 was objected to for not showing "a plurality of drain lines DL which extend in the Y direction and are arranged in parallel in the X direction in the pixel region AR except at an edge of the pixel region AR" as recited in the amended specification.

As indicated, the specification is being amended to delete the recitation "and are arranged in parallel in the X direction" in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the outstanding informality rejection is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

Prior Art Rejections

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,710,827 to Kubo et al. (hereinafter "Kubo") in view of US Patent No. 6,912,034 to Nagano et al. (hereinafter "Nagano"). As outlined above, claim 3 is being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering this prior art rejection moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

As indicated by the Examiner in the Office Action, claims 1-2 were considered allowable over the prior art of record. Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for his consideration.

In view of all the above, Applicants will submit that the cite prior art references and their combinations fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the present invention as now claimed. As such, the present invention as now claimed is distinguishable and thereby allowable over the rejections raised in the Office Action.


Conclusion

In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art reference upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicants respectfully contend that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344


Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

August 15, 2007

SPF/JCM/